

From the Editors

This issue begins with three articles providing different perspectives on legal education reform. We then provide five eclectic articles on legal education and legal scholarship—ranging from Islamic law to malleability as a concept to the potential spiritual dimension of law. Two prominent scholars then offer insightful book reviews.

The article by Kristen Holmquist, Marjorie Shultz, Sheldon Zedeck and David Oppenheimer, “Measuring Merit: The Shultz-Zedeck Research on Law School Admissions,” offers a real challenge to how law schools choose to admit their students. The article documents the strong negative impact of the LSAT on minority admissions to law school and suggests that, instead or in addition to diversity programs to get around the impact of the LSAT, the alternative Schultz-Zedeck measure of traits that a successful lawyer needs can supplement or replace the LSAT. Their measures potentially have major implications not only for admissions but also for how we train lawyers and assess the output of legal education.

Stephen Daniels, Martin Katz and William Sullivan provide a quantitative study on legal education reform, “Analyzing Carnegie’s Reach: The Contingent Nature of Innovation.” The article examines the pace and depth of legal education reform in the period before and after the publication of the Carnegie Study, finding a step up in educational innovation in the period around 2008. Interestingly, they ask who the leaders and laggards are in relation to categories of schools, finding more and faster innovation in the so-called third tier rather than in the so-called top schools.

Lee Peoples focuses on legal education reform through an architectural perspective on law libraries—and a defense of the need for law libraries today. His article, “Designing a Law Library to Encourage Learning,” suggests that a new generation of law libraries must adapt to the very different spatial needs of students and faculty in the era of the Internet, mobile devices, and reduced need for printed books.

The next five articles offer a fascinating mix of perspectives and insights, beginning with Lena Salaymeh’s critique of law school efforts to recruit people to teach “Islamic Law” but above all remain responsive to American fears and prejudices. Her article on “Commodifying ‘Islamic law’ in the U.S. Legal Academy” provides a nice primer on the variety of subjects that need to be distinguished from the so-called Islamic law category and the problems with simply catering to the U.S. appetite. Scott Dodson makes the case for “The Short Paper” in legal scholarship, which seems quite obvious but in fact faces numerous obstacles that he also examines. Peter Gabel distills decades of his own work into a provocative lecture on “The Spiritual Dimension of

Social Justice,” challenging the social “disconnectedness” embedded in our legal doctrines and practices.

Finally, Melissa Weresh, in “Stargate: Malleability as a Threshold Concept in Legal Education,” teaches us about the idea of a “threshold concept” in education generally, then suggesting that we can understand legal education and its learning processes by zeroing in on malleability—the recognition that legal texts and doctrines are highly flexible and that the ability to manipulate them is a defining trait for lawyers.

The two book reviews are also quite learned and interesting. Paul Horwitz reviews James Hackney, Jr.’s *Legal Intellectuals in Conversation: Reflections on the Construction of American Legal Theory*. Professor Horwitz also asks what it is that energizes a generation of legal scholars—as in the 1980s—to rethink and do battle over the construction of legal theory—from “law and economics” to “critical legal studies” to “law and society” and more.

Tanya Hernández juxtaposes two seemingly unrelated books, Victoria Saker Woeste’s *Henry Ford’s War on the Jews and the Legal Battle Against Hate Speech* and Mariana Valverde’s *Everyday Law on the Street: City Governance in an Age of Diversity*, to illustrate the major difficulties that the law has protecting minorities with colorblind remedies against, for example, group libel and the everyday injustices emerging from changing urban demographics.

This volume concludes the tenure of this editorial team. We have enjoyed and learned much from this experience. We are grateful to those who submitted manuscripts, reviewed them, and provided suggestions. One of us, Molly Selvin, will continue to help produce the JLE along with the new co-editors at Northeastern University School of Law, Dean Jeremy Paul and Professor Margaret Woo, but the other two of us look forward to becoming consumers of the JLE again.

Bryant G. Garth
Gowri Ramachandran
Molly Selvin